

HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
JANUARY 26, 2004

The Hamilton County Board of Commissioners met on Monday, January 26, 2004 in the Commissioners Courtroom in the Hamilton County Government and Judicial Center, One Hamilton County Square, Noblesville, Indiana. The Commissioners met in Executive Session at 12:15 pm in Conference Room 1A.

**Board of Finance:** [1:02:53]

Hamilton County Board of Finance President Steve Holt called the January 26, 2004 meeting to order and declared a quorum present of Christine Altman, Steven C. Dillinger, Steven A. Holt and Sally Wilson.

**Election of Officers**

**President:**

Dillinger nominated Steve Holt as President of the Board of Finance. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Secretary:**

Holt nominated Sally Wilson as Secretary of the Board of Finance. Dillinger seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**2003 Investment Report:**

Ms. Wilson motioned to table the Investment Report to be heard in two weeks. She is waiting for information from a couple of Banks so she can complete her report. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Dillinger motioned to adjourn the Board of Finance meeting. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Board of Commissioners Public Meeting** [1:04:56]

President Steve Dillinger called the public session of the January 26, 2004 Board of Commissioners meeting to order. A quorum was declared present of Commissioner Christine Altman, Commissioner Steven C. Dillinger and Commissioner Steven A. Holt. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

**Approval of Minutes:**

Holt motioned to approve the minutes of January 12, 2004 and January 14, 2004. Altman seconded. Motion carries. Altman abstained from voting on the January 14, 2004 minutes, as she was not in attendance at that meeting.

**Executive Session Memorandum:**

Holt motioned to approve the Executive Session Memorandum of January 26, 2004. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Plat Approval** [1:06:10]

**Woodland Golf Country Club:**

Mr. Steve Broermann requested approval of the replat of Lots 3 and 4 of the Woodland Golf Club. Altman motioned to approve. Dillinger seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Annual Bid Awards 2004:**

Mr. Brad Davis requested approval of the award for 2004 Annual Highway Bids to the following: **Category 1 - Aggregates:** 1a to Irving Materials, Inc. and 1b to US Aggregates, Inc. **Category 2 - Bituminous Mixes** award to Shelly & Sands, Inc. for the area of the county west of SR 19 and north of SR 32 and the area west of White River and south of SR 32. Award to E&B Paving, Inc. Stony Creek for the remainder of the county. **Category 3 - Liquid Asphalts** award for 3a to Asphalt Materials, Inc. and 3b to Marathon Ashland Petroleum. **Category 4 - Pipes/Drainage Structures** award 4a and 4b to St. Regis Culvert, Inc. **Category 5 - Pre-engineered Bridges & Components** - previous years bid from American Timber Bridge & Culvert, Inc. was extended through 2004. **Category 6 - Gasoline/Fuel & Lubricants** award to Hamilton County Co-Op. **Category 7 - Salt** award to Cargill, Inc. Category 8 - Pavement Traffic Markings award 8a, 8b, 8f, 8g and 8h to T & R Pavement Markings, Inc. 8c award to Airmarking Co. 8d and 8e to Interstate Road Management, Inc. **Category 9 - Weed and Brush Control Chemicals** award to Townsend Tree Service Co., Inc. **Category 10 - Tree and Stump Removal** award to Mt. Hood Tree Care. Altman motioned to approve the annual bid awards as submitted. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Acceptance of Bonds/Letters of Credit - Highway Department:**

Mr. Jim Neal requested acceptance of Bonds and Letters of Credit for the Highway Department. 1) HCHD #B-03-0006 - Great American Insurance Company Continuing Certification of Bond No. 5447152 issued on behalf of S & B Construction Co., Inc. in the sum of \$24,750 to now expire January 29, 2005. 2) HCHD #B-03-0007 - Great American Insurance Company Continuing Certification of Bond No. 5447151 issued on behalf of S & B Construction Co., Inc. in the sum of \$15,000 to now expire January 29, 2005. 3) HCHD #B-03-0147 - Employers Mutual Casualty Company Bond No. S545740 changed by Rider dated October 25, 2003 to Bond No. S288223, everything else remaining the same. 4) HCHD #B-04-0004 - Western Surety Company Permit Bond #92310256 issued on behalf of Flynn and Zinkan Holdings II LLC in the sum of \$5,000 for a water tap for Kroger Plaza Project, 605' N of the intersection of 116th Street and Olio Road, along the west side of Olio Road to expire January 9, 2005. 5) HCHD #L-03-0001 - Provident Bank Letter of Credit No. S009917 is extended to expire April 5, 2005 for Merrimac Corporation. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Agreements/Supplements** [1:16:24]

**Utility Agreements:**

**Small Structure #21061, Eagle Creek Avenue over Little Eagle Creek:**

Mr. Neal requested approval of Utility Agreements, HCHD #M-04-0010, with Insight and HCHD #M-04-0011 with Cinergy for Small Structure #21061, Eagle Creek Avenue over Little Eagle Creek. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Bridge #132, Pennington Road over Weaver Ditch:**

Mr. Neal requested approval of Utility Agreements, HCHD #M-04-0012 with PSI Energy, Inc. and HCHD #M-04-0013 with SBC Ameritech for Bridge #132, Pennington Road over Weaver Ditch.

**Bridge #145 Supplemental Agreement #3:**

Mr. Neal requested approval of Supplemental Agreement No. 3, HCHD #E-96-0013, with DLZ for Bridge #145 Oak Road over Cool Creek. Altman motioned to approve. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Non-Standard Street Signs - Westwood Subdivision:**

Mr. Neal requested approval of a Statement of Agreement and Liability, HCHD #M-04-0014, for installation of non-standard signs and posts for Westwood Subdivision. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Sewer Line Within Right-of-Way:**

Mr. Neal requested approval of an Agreement Regarding Sewer Line Within Right of Way, HCHD #M-04-0009, with Richard A. and Susan F. Billington. This agreement is for installation of a private force main to serve one house on a public parkway in Washington Township. This agreement contains language that when Westfield Utilities runs a line, this property

HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
JANUARY 26, 2004

will tie in to the gravity main. Holt asked who maintains the force main? Mr. Neal stated it is the property owner's to maintain. Altman asked if there is a sewer line within right of way, are we requiring that they install laterals to tie in for each lot that is platted along the way? Mr. Neal stated if is a new sewer line and there is existing lots, we request that they do. He does not know that we have ever said they have to, they usually do will do it. Altman stated she thinks we would be doing the future homeowners and ourselves a service if we make that a requirement of approval. Altman motioned to approve. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Agreement to Improve Roadway:**

Mr. Neal requested approval of an Agreement to Improve Roadway, HCHD #M-04-0008, with Boomerang Development for 131st Street from Boone County Line to West Road. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Concurrence with Traffic Study Correspondence:** [1:23:24]

Mr. Neal requested Concurrence with Traffic Study Correspondence Concerning Investigation of Requests for Signage on Hamilton County Roads. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Official Actions**

**Prairie Baptist Road:**

Mr. Neal requested approval of the Official Action for installation of Regulatory Signs on Prairie Baptist Road in Fall Creek, Wayne and White River Townships. This action will enact a 50 MPH on Prairie Baptist Road from 141st Street to Strawtown Ave. and 45 MPH on Prairie Baptist Road from SR 238 to 136th Street. Holt motioned to approve. Dillinger seconded. Holt and Dillinger approved. Altman opposed. Motion carries.

**Request Permission to Advertise**

**Bridge #145, Oak Road over Cool Creek:**

Mr. Neal requested permission to advertise for the replacement of Bridge #145, Oak Road over Cool Creek in Washington Township. Bid opening will be held February 23, 2004. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Holt stated we had three bridges on Oak Road that we looked at several years ago, two were pretty close to each other and one at the north end. Mr. Knight stated Bridge #145 is just north of 151st Street. Holt asked what is it being built out of? Mr. Knight stated it is a timber bridge. Holt asked the other two bridges as well? Mr. Knight stated there is one other bridge on Oak Road and it is timber. Holt asked if the bridge to the north is done? Mr. Knight stated yes. Mr. Neal also requested signatures on the Title Sheet. Motion carried unanimously.

**Bridge #82, Crooked Creek Avenue over Cicero Creek, Consultant Selection:**

Mr. Neal requested selection of a Consultant for Engineering Services for Bridge #82, Crooked Creek Avenue over Cicero Creek. Mr. Neal stated this is a federal aid project. Holt motioned to appoint Floyd E. Burroughs & Associates. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**146th Street Extension Scope Analysis:** [1:29:13]

Mr. Joel Thurman stated the Commissioners received a revised copy of the 146th Street Extension Scope Analysis Executive Summary. This project analysis helps us determine the typical section we want to use prior to getting design started and completing the 146th Street Extension corridor. The analysis assumed that the corridor is broken in to two different areas, the first area being from SR 37 to Cumberland Road and the second area everything east of Cumberland Road to Sand Creek Bridge. The project analysis looked at four alternatives for each segment. Those being for the sections from SR 37 to Cumberland Road they looked at a three lane rural section, a five lane rural section, a three lane urban section, and a five lane urban section. Likewise for the section between Cumberland Road and Sand Creek Bridge, a two lane rural section, a four lane rural section, a two lane urban section and a four lane urban section. The Executive Summary describes all of those sections. Some of the factors that went in to the analysis is the constructability, the right of way impacts and the construction costs. The Executive Summary recommended the five lane rural section for the area from SR 37 to Cumberland Road and a four lane rural section from Cumberland Road to Sand Creek. Those recommendations came in with the thought that they are the most cost effective, workable solutions at this time. The Highway Department recommends the Executive Summary, the five lane rural section and the four lane rural section. Dillinger asked if these details have been worked out with Noblesville? Mr. Thurman stated we have spoken with Noblesville, we are going to try to meet with them to discuss further details. We are aware they are using an urban section on their portion of the road from I-69 to Sand Creek Bridge. We could look at using various sections as well. It is easy to change typical sections at intersections. Altman stated we were going to meet with Noblesville and she would like to make sure we are on the same page with this project. Mr. Howard stated as he recalls, Noblesville was very interested in a urban cross section. Noblesville has a Tax Increment District in place that when it gets to funding this project they will be able to bring \$10-\$12 million to the table. It could probably fund the marginal costs. Dillinger asked if they could fund the marginal costs between rural and urban? Mr. Howard stated he does not know what those are, but they are going to be bringing quite a bit of money to help fund it. Tabling this for two weeks will make no difference. Altman stated she has copies of the Bill that was passed by Congress and Hamilton County is earmarked for \$1 million on this project. We are waiting for the President to sign it. Dillinger asked about the Riverwalk? Altman stated we have \$500,000 for the Riverwalk. Holt asked if Christine's comments were a motion? Altman stated yes. Holt seconded the motion to table. Motion carried unanimously. Altman would like to arrange a meeting with Noblesville in the next couple of weeks. Mr. Thurman stated they are trying to set up a meeting with Noblesville, Jim Neal, himself, and USI Consultants in the next two weeks. Holt told Mr. Thurman to go ahead and have that meeting so from a technical standpoint they know where we are coming from and then we will follow up with a meeting with the Mayor. Holt asked Mr. Swift to schedule it the week Dillinger returns.

**Bridges #69, #70 and #72 Design Exceptions:**

Mr. Neal requested approval of the Design Exceptions for repairs to Bridges #69, East 266th Street over Duck Creek; #70, East 266th Street over Bear Creek; and #72, East 266th Street over Cicero Creek. The guardrail transitions they currently have do not meet current standards. In order to bring those up to current standards we would have to acquire right of way so we are proposing leaving the existing in and do the other work for the bridges and when they come up for major rehab, which will be in 5-10 years, then at that point we will install the proper end treatments on those bridges. Holt stated by the time the major rehab comes, the specifications may change. Mr. Howard asked if Mr. Neal would classify any of these as construction or substantial reconstruction? Mr. Neal stated no. Most of these are milling off the surface and putting a new surface on. One bridge we may have to replace a beam. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Small Structure 32059, Cal Carson Road over Taylor Creek Funding:** [1:40:09]

Mr. Neal stated they have looked at their bridge program to find funding for Small Structure 32059, Cal Carson Road over Taylor Creek. Mr Neal proposed delaying the following three projects: Bridge #76, Ray Parker Road over Bear Creek, Bridge #86, Rulon Road over Weasel Creek and Bridge #106, Little Chicago Road over Morse Reservoir. Holt motioned to accept Highway's recommendation. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
JANUARY 26, 2004

**Olio Road Interlocal Agreement with Fishers:**

Mr. Neal stated they have found the interlocal agreement with Fishers regarding Olio Road. The agreement states that Olio Road from 96th Street to SR 238 is to remain in the County's inventory.

**Federal Aid Submittal Update:** [1:43:02]

Mr. Brad Davis stated he has spoken to Mike Deering, MPO Manager, regarding their Call for Projects. This Call for Projects period is for 2005-2007, which are the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) submittals. They do this every year, so there will be another Call for the 2006-2008 period. When we asked him when funds would be available for any kind of project, Mr. Deering stated we could submit for 2004. In doing that you would have to ask for an amendment to that TIP. He led us to believe that we could apply for any year, 2004, 2005, 2006 or 2007. Past 2007 you are not asking for funding, there is no advantage to ask beyond 2007. Mr. Davis stated the Highway Department recommends submitting for the 2005-2007 TIP. The first project would be the intersection of 104th Street and Olio Road. We are ready to construct that project and we recommend applying for 2004 funding and request an amendment to the TIP. We have the money for the match. The second project is 96th Street from Mollenkopf to Fall Creek. We suggest applying for 2005. We still need to buy right of way, but we think we have the money that will carry over to buy right of way. We would need match money of approximately \$500,000 if we were successful. The third and fourth projects to apply for are Olio Road (2 sections) for 2006, which we hope will be concurrent with the bridge project, this would require a match of \$650,000 and then the southern portion of Olio Road for 2007 with a match of \$650,000 is needed. When you do a submittal that adds capacity to the roadway you have to get it in their plan. Mr. Davis stated they discussed beyond 2007 and Mr. Deering suggested that if we know of projects that we might be considering for beyond 2007, to submit them and they would be part of their plan, we are not asking for money at this point, we are asking to be included in that TIP period so they know what is coming up. Mr. Davis suggested the 96th Street section, 236th and the last section of 146th Street. Altman asked if this is an alert for planning for the MPO? Mr. Davis stated yes, as you get closer and the periods roll around, then you would submit at that point. Altman asked if that resolves Holt's issue? Holt stated yes. Holt asked Mr. Davis if you asked Mr. Deering how many dollars were currently in the pipeline? Mr. Davis stated no, he said there was room in all those years. INDOT allows them to over program in some years, but they have to be aware of is that their overall period after 2009 can not exceed total dollar amount that is allocated. Altman asked why would we not put 96th Street and Towne Road intersection in, for the planning portion? Mr. Neal stated it is not a capacity increase. Mr. Davis stated it could go in as a TIP Project, even for 2004. Mr. Davis stated he thought we crossed it off the list last week. Dillinger stated we did. Holt stated when we did that we were operating under a different set of facts and if he is saying there is a 2004 potential, why not put 96th and Towne back in? Altman motioned to approve as amended. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Dillinger called a break.

Dillinger called the meeting back to order. [1:50:34]

**Juvenile Detention Center Update:**

Mr. Larry Dawson stated they would like to present an update, schedule and estimated budget for the Juvenile Detention Center. We want to discuss the design development, we are not seeking permission to pass the design development stage, we will request that at the next meeting. Funding will need to be requested from the County Council, which will be paid back once the bonds are sold. Mr. Joe Mrak, RQAW, presented a Power Point presentation regarding the site plan and design for the Juvenile Detention Center project. (Verbatim tape is available in the Auditor's Office) The site work is impacting 16 acres of ground. At the existing site there is a swale that runs through the site. That will be filled due to the location of the new Juvenile Detention Center. We will abandon the current driveway and construct a new entrance that will access all buildings on the site for the public. A new entrance will be created north of the site for employees, deliveries and in-custody residents. The building is 110,000 square feet of new building. The existing building is 9,000 square feet. It is a one story building. There will be a series of residential programs which include in-take [11 beds], shelter care [20 beds], probation violator pod [20 beds], and secured detention pod [80 beds]. There is a total of 131 beds in the new facility, 21 beds in the old facility for total of 152 beds. We will have the ability to expand on this site to the north and the west for additional pods. There will also be a series of non-residential programs - out of school suspension will have two classrooms for a total of 24 students. There is day treatment, evening reporting for 25 youth, transition and placement prevention program, LEAPP Program for 12 students in two different classrooms. There are two multi-purpose rooms, but each one can be divided up into a total of six classrooms. There are four counseling rooms, two individual counseling rooms, two classrooms that are divisible to provide four classrooms and four classrooms are included in the secure detention area. The classrooms that are provided in the program space of the non-residential area, the kids from detention will not access those classrooms. They are completely separate parts of the facility. We can't mix residential and non-residential kids. The front entrance faces south, everyone except staff and in-custody children will enter through the front entrance. The in-take and assessment area is where all the kids start. There are short term holding cells where initial intake will be held. The original program had included a court facility and a Juvenile Prosecutor's office. Those programs were taken out of this design and in their place we put an arraignment court within the in-take center so arraignments can be held by video. We also have office spaces for Probation and Community Corrections. It is a single story building, we wanted to create a therapeutic environment, it will be light and very open with skylights and courtyards to get natural light. The cells will not have windows to the outside, we will have clear vaulted lights with clear story lighting that will let natural light into the common spaces. The doors to the cells will have large panes of glass, there will be plenty of light, just not from the outside wall. The exterior of the building will emulate the rest of the campus. [2:24:40] Holt asked Mr. Mrak to identify the location of the arraignment court. Holt asked how many youth do you anticipate doing a video arraignment with on a given day. Mr. Bob Bragg stated it varies 2-5 youths per day. Holt asked why is that room so large? Mr. Mrak stated that room will be subdivided, the equipment will be mobile and it can be stored in that room. That room can also be used as a conference room. That room is 496 square feet. Altman asked how many people does a Probation Office accommodate? Mr. Mrak stated there are a total of 22 offices in the Probation area. This includes counselors, program directors and teachers. Altman asked how large are these offices? Mr. Mrak stated they are all designed for an office and a group of four visitors, plus the Probation Officer. They are 160 square feet. Holt stated he thought we voted to keep Probation in the Judicial Center. Altman stated that was her recollection also. Holt asked if you designed under the concept that there would be no offices for any Juvenile Probation staff, other than who was working in-take on a 24/7 basis. Mr. Mrak stated we do not have offices in the in-take center for probation. Holt asked who has offices in the in-take area? Mr. Mrak stated the in-take area offices are the book-in counter and the secured Sheriff's employees. Holt asked when you programmed for Juvenile Probation Officers, what number did you program for? Mr. Mrack stated a total of 22. Holt asked to do in-take? Mr. Jeff Marcum stated there are six. Holt stated we agreed to that, we specifically voted to not have Juvenile Probation Officers on that site. Holt asked when you worked on this plan you worked under the assumption those folks would be in this building? Mr. Bragg stated yes. Holt asked who is going to sit in these 22 offices on Cumberland Road? Mr. Bragg stated they are being designed for people handling the programming. Holt asked 22 people in addition to the 13 people we

HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
JANUARY 26, 2004

already have? Mr. Bragg stated that was the assumption. Altman stated that was not her recollection of the scope. Holt agreed. Altman asked where is the white space for future expansion? Mr. Mrak pointed out where the expansion locations would be. There would be three pods for an additional 24 beds for a total of 80 detention beds. Altman stated she understood we were going to build perimeter space, but not finish it until demand indicated it was necessary. Where is that space? Mr. Mrak stated on this plan there is nothing that has perimeter walls and empty shelled space. Altman stated that is what we agreed, we would build the space but not incur the finishing costs until needed. Mr. Mrak stated we did add 24 beds to the program that was originally recommended by Bobby Huskey. We can bid it as a shelled space with an alternate to build it out in the future. The plan shows all the pods being built out internally. Altman stated Huskey's Study was a total of 56 secured beds? Mr. Mrak stated he believes that is correct. Altman asked if there are any other variances from the scope of what we discussed when you embarked on this project? Mr. Bragg stated not that he is aware of. Mr. Dawson stated the only other thing that could possibly be is that there are more space in each pod from when we originally started. That came from visiting other sites and seeing what they were doing. Mr. Mrak stated the team took a tour up to the St. Joe County facility and that is where the idea came to have natural lighting in the day room and open the cells up towards the day room. The original configuration for the day room space was triangular and that configuration did not give us the ability to do that and have a large enough day room to have all of the cells get natural light. Altman asked if any of the design change increase your staffing expectations for correctional officers? Mr. Jeff Marcum stated it could reduce as much as four people. Holt asked if 44 was the number of additional personnel? Mr. Marcum stated the most we were looking at was 32. Altman stated it is four people, so basically one shift per day? Mr. Marcum stated yes. Holt stated early on we talked about the limited number of space and the logic of going two story to preserve real estate so our site on Cumberland Road could be a county build at and stay on Cumberland Road. This plan has skylights and is one story, which he is assuming would not allow us to build a floor on top of these pods. Mr. Dawson stated when we were talking about a two-story and we were going to expand the Juvenile Detention Center up to the fence line only, therefore we were not planning on building on the rest of the site. We think it will be more economical to stay with this plan and not go two-story and not spend the money to go with all the footings and foundations now. We have a lot of expansion space that we will be able to expand into over many years on that existing site. Mr. Dawson stated the offices for Probation is something we look at and make sure we are all in agreement and we can look at the white space and what we are taking out the ability to finish it. We can also add that into the bid process as an "add alternate". We can look at that to see if you want to finish it or do not want to finish it at this time. Holt asked if all the ground east of the parking for staff is buildable, from SR 37 to the parking lot? Mr. Mrak stated from the Jail north to SR 37 and the east side of the Juvenile Center is all buildable space. The fueling station and impound lot will be moved to the north end of the facility. At the point in time when the tower is relocated, all that ground will be available for development. Altman asked if we need to relocate the tower with this project? Mr. Mrak stated no. Dillinger stated the reason it is available is the retention pond on the east side of SR 37 is county property and we will use that dirt for filling the swale. Holt asked how many acres is the detention pond? Mr. Paul ? with Cripe Engineering stated the pond is 2.5 acres. Holt asked for the development of the balance of that site, did you figure out where you were putting this so we don't cut ourselves off? Paul stated the location of the pond was determined by the location of the existing legal drain. Mr. Dan Mayer stated the site is half wooded and half field. We will be encroaching into the open field about 25-30 feet. Holt asked if the northeast quadrant developable or is it a wetland? Paul stated it has wetlands in it. Altman asked if the site selection for the retention pond is based on topography? Paul stated yes. Altman stated rather than the existence of the current legal drain. Paul stated both were taken into consideration for the design. We did design around the wetlands to minimize impact. Paul stated at some point the County Surveyor has a design for the entire watershed for this area which includes a regional detention basin. This basin has been sized and it will accommodate a regional retention basin on this site. The regulated drain has been extended and we have allowed for the discharge rate that was determined by the County Surveyor. We will replace the open swale with a regulated drain that will accommodate a future regional detention basin. Mr. Mayer stated we figured the amount of dirt we needed to fill in at the Juvenile Detention site and that is where the size comes from. It is a little bigger than what we need for detention, but it is the dirt we need to fill in on the site. Paul stated the pipe has been sized for future detention. Altman asked how are we going to get to and from that site for moving dirt? Mr. Howard stated there is a road being constructed along the Pedcor project, north of Home Depot. That road has yet to be dedicated and will not be substantially complete until Spring. He has spoken to the developer at Pedcor and they have 2" of base down and they will put the 6" of binder down, the City Engineer would inspect it, sign off on it so it would become a haul road for us, hopefully within 15 days of the plants opening in early April. It would only delay us 10 days and compared to the alternative we can incur the 10 days very easily. We will have to get a small easement along the north side of the Pedcor property from Richard Mallery. Altman asked if the binder would hold up under the weight? Mr. Mayer stated yes. [2:48:15] Mr. Mayer presented an update on the schedule and the budget. Mr. Howard stated we are within the ceiling scheduled by the County Council. Mr. Howard suggested that there be a meeting of the minds on the Probation offices and this build-out. You may want to have two alternates, one for \$8.3 and the other alternate would be to fill the other full pod that is in the northwest corner. Those alternates would give you flexibility to meet your financing parameters and you may say those pods are too high and we don't want to do it right now. Altman stated the office space as designed are fixed wall? Mr. Mrak stated yes, because the offices were set up to have group meeting within them, they were set up to be private offices. Altman asked if there is any opportunity for costs savings to use partition walls on the non-private areas. Mr. Mrak stated there might be, we would have to look at which offices those are and how it might impact the operation. Altman stated it would give us flexibility for reconfiguration in the future. Altman asked how often are conferences employed? Mr. Bragg stated mainly it is meeting with kids and their parents. Holt stated if you are a probation officer, you will get information you currently don't have as the juvenile comes in. Mr. Bragg stated the preliminary investigation is done when they come in. Holt stated if the required meeting you have three weeks later would be held in the Judicial Center? Mr. Bragg stated right. That space would mainly be used with the kids that are in the detention center, the shelter care facility, probation violators and kids going through programming, not necessarily your daily check in appointments. Holt stated that would not require 22 offices. Mr. Bragg stated not at this time. Holt stated how many offices would it take on a daily basis to talk to those kids? Mr. Bragg stated we are looking at about six programs that are being run out there, the plan was that school probation officers would use that space as well. Altman stated we need to look hard at it. We have a significant portion of this new facility eaten up by office space, that first of all was not planned and have extremely generous offices compared to industry. We need to look at it to see if it is justified as a build out now. Mr. Bragg stated the design team asked how many people would be using these offices, we decided five would be the maximum and the square footage was designed as such. Altman stated it would be helpful if Probation came up with numbers on a typical day, how many conferences would you have and go from there for planning. We could see if we could retrofit this with more small conference. We could have better security in those conference areas if there is a problem. Holt asked if you considered conference rooms and cubicles? Mr. Mrak stated all we considered were fixed, individual offices sized for five people. That was a result of the Huskey Study. Holt asked if Mr. Mrak was present when we decided not to go down that path? Mr. Mrak stated he believes he was. Holt asked why did we design it

HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
JANUARY 26, 2004

that way? Mr. Mrak stated he does not have an answer for that. Mr. Howard stated he is trying to write a statement of need for the DLGF and if we have five probation officers and 22 offices and another 11 offices and he does not understand how five people and maybe some other programming gets to that number. Mr. Mrak stated the five numbers are all the program coordinators and counselors for the non-residential programs. Mr. Howard stated that takes care of the 11. How did we get to the 22 offices for five Probation Officers? Mr. Mrak stated there are offices for 22 Probation Officers, as the plan states. Altman stated this might be an opportunity to have a certain area that would be finished and another area that we do white space for storage for the Jail or Work Release until needed, as a bid alternate. Altman stated the design is well thought out and she is not criticizing the design she is criticizing that perhaps it is beyond the scope of what we contemplated. Holt stated back to the 11 offices that are the non-probation offices, if he understood correctly, in the Huskey Report the majority of those are part-timers that would come in on a consulting basis, they would not be full time staff. To build them a 160 square foot office to meet with four other people seems to him that cubicles and the appropriate number of conference rooms would be a lot better stewardship. Altman asked to look at it. They will be discussing confidential issues and we will have better results that way, but let's do it through a few small conference areas that are sound proofed. Mr. Mrak stated those particular rooms are smaller than 160 square feet, but they still accommodate small groups of people. Your comments are duly noted. Holt stated back to the video courtroom, he thinks it is too big if we are talking about 2-5 people. If you look at the space the Sheriff utilizes for a larger number, it is a much smaller room. Altman stated we may want to look at an overall contraction of room sizes, unless there is a reason. Holt stated the video room would be used 45 minutes a day, 5 days a week. Mr. Bragg stated it depends what you would use it for. If you use it for detention hearings, they would be used 5 days a week for a couple of hours. Holt stated the vote was taken that detention hearings were going to take place here. We eliminated the courtroom all together. This afternoon the first we have heard there is a video courtroom. The Huskey Report did not talk about doing video detention hearings. The Huskey Report did not talk about video proceedings at all. Altman stated the video might be an afterthought that might be a good idea. Let's make sure we are sized right. Holt stated what you need is a conference room with a closet that locks off that can hold the video equipment. Any conference room would be workable, presuming you had a large storage closet that you could lock. Any multi-purpose space would work. Dillinger asked what direction are we giving them? [3:02:04] Altman stated she would like to look at it a little bit more and a listing of what these are comprised of. Will the delay of lack of direction cause extreme problems? Mr. Mayer stated we came today to get exactly what we are hearing. We would like to come back in two weeks, we would like to ask approval to bid site work and we would like to present a more refined design answering the questions you have asked today. Mr. Mrak stated we have a committee meeting Thursday where we will be presenting the schematic design of the facility to the Committee and get their comments. After the consensus of the Committee we would come back to the Commissioners for approval of the schematic design. The comments he has noted are 1) Probation offices - why are they in the facility and there may be some consideration of eliminating them totally or shelling out an area of the building and possibly building that out in the future. 2) Look at shelling out of 24 beds of the detention unit, one 16 bed unit and one 8 bed unit. 3). Look at using movable or cubicle walls instead of fixed walls to change the operational concept of the offices for individual offices and use more individual conference rooms. 4) Video arraignment - look at the size of the room. Right now it is not intended to be a full blown courtroom, it is intended to a conference room with movable video equipment. Altman stated one thing that would be helpful for her would be on the Probation space, on the footprint as designed, to give us an idea if we were to eliminate a substantial portion of the finish costs, what would be the costs be to shell it out verses just eliminating it. Mr. Mrak stated they distributed to the Committee a schematic design report that has a summary of the architectural program in it and it has the list of all the spaces, the size and how many people each of those spaces accommodate. That is something the Design Committee will be reviewing on Thursday. Holt asked if it could have been distributed to the Commissioners? Mr. Mrak stated we wanted to have the Committee look at this report before it was officially presented to the Commissioners. [3:06:41] Holt stated he would like them to consider out shelling out pods as an alternate, the four pods that are a footprint verses shelling out office space. Altman stated her personal opinion is that it is too much at this point. We have converted to shelling out 24 beds that are far in excess of what the Huskey Report was. We have it reserved in the footprint at that site. Her vote would be to not incur that cost. She would rather have administrative space shelled out because of the tightness in this building, we will have to go somewhere. Dillinger stated he would not be in favor of shelling out the pods. Altman stated look at a contraction of room sizing to make sure we are not oversized on most of these rooms. Holt asked if you could pull the Shelter Care to the north? Mr. Mrak stated we wanted to get an access off the lobby and directly off of the exterior. Holt asked him to look at that. Mr. Dawson stated we will go back to the Committee this week and convey the items brought up today. We still think we can meet the budget that you set. When we come back to the next meeting we will be requesting permission to go to bid for site work and we may need a bit more details of the site work so you understand where the site work will be done. Then Mr. Howard will be able to go to the County Council to get approval for a certain amount of dollars that would allow us to start the site work and that money would be appropriated and refunded back to the Council once the project bonds are sold. Once we know the bids on the site we will know exactly what dollars we can build the building with and we can still have protective alternates to bring the price in where you want it. Dillinger asked what is the current square footage of the current facility? Mr. Dawson stated 9,000 square feet. Holt confirmed this is 110, 000 square feet? Mr. Dawson stated yes. Dillinger asked if you are going to try to look at rotating the Shelter Care, what exactly is done in the Probation violators unit? Could you rotate that with it? Mr. Mrak stated the Probation violators is considered to be a staff secured facility, which is different than the secured detention. We want to keep the Probation violators as close to in-take as possible. The shelter care kids don't have anything to do with the in-take center and we want to have them off by themselves. Altman asked when you talk about going to Council for a temporary loan for site costs, are you talking about \$3 million? Mr. Howard stated no, we will be asking for approximately \$1.5 million. We are looking at getting the bad soil out of hole and getting the soil on site to build a building pad. Dillinger asked what are the rooms classified as medical? Mr. Mrak stated in the medical infirmary has a waiting room, toilet for the youth, one examination room, dental room, nurses office, medical supplies and equipment storage, clean utility room and a dirty utility & bio-hazardous waste room, secure medication storage, medical records storage an office with three cubicles for contract medical professionals. There is an office for psychologist, clerical work area, two padded cells, staff toilet and two medical isolation rooms for kids with communicable diseases can be isolated from the general population. Altman asked if there is anyway to share with the adults and keep them separated? Mr. Mrak stated in the way of staff, he would have to study the facility. Mr. Howard stated you could move staff back and forth because you will violate the sight and contact between juveniles and adults. Moving staff back and forth and a little less square footage would be cheaper. Altman stated we don't want to fill them both up, she would want to move staff back and forth. Holt asked what are the shared services? Holt asked Mr. Mrak to send the books to them before the next meeting. Mr. Mrak stated shared services is laundry, loading dock, maintenance office and storage, central janitor's closet, supplies for the building, mechanical, electrical room and computer and phone server rooms. Mr. Dawson stated they will be meeting with the Design Committee this week and investigating everything we talked about, preparing those changes and bring it back at the next meeting. The Commissioners will have a program book prior to the meeting.



HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
JANUARY 26, 2004

**Judicial Center Interior Renovations:**

Mr. Dawson presented the Commissioners with the cost projections for the Judicial Center interior renovations. Jon Dierdorf, Browning, Day, Mullins & Dierdorf Architects, stated the project consists of moving the Planning Department downstairs, expanding the Prosecutor's Office, and some small work for ISSD. We have been meeting with the various staff. Mr. Dawson stated they have estimated the project, with the expanded scope the cost has expanded. We have contingency money for the project, based on what has happened in the past in this building. We can guarantee the prices will not exceed those numbers. There has been no approval by the County Council for the construction of this project. They have approved \$40,000 for design. If this Commissioners want to proceed, we will have to go to Council for approval of the project. If this is the correct scope, we would be ready to bid at least two weeks from now. Altman stated she can't believe the cost, she built a whole house for significantly less than this. It is ridiculous. Mr. Dawson stated if they would like a more detailed presentation, they could do that. Mr. Howard stated you will have to do this for Council. He does not see them funding this number without additional information. Holt asked if we could plan it for four weeks? Mr. Dawson stated that is ok. Altman stated she would like the breakdown. Mr. Dawson stated he will have that for the Commissioners prior to the four weeks.

Mr. Dawson requested approval of Envoy's contract for this project. Mr. Howard stated the cost is 5% of the budget which would be \$30,000 which would consume 75% of the design budget. Altman stated per statute she did not think we were to go by percentages? Mr. Howard stated you can't for a controlled project. By the time they get to the Local Tax Control Board, it shall be a percentage, it has to be reduced to a fixed number. Altman asked why don't we go per hour? Mr. Dawson stated this would be the only project we would have on a per hour rate. Normally when people in our business keep hours it is because they are going to justify getting more money. Holt stated he would be more comfortable with a flat fee, it has served us well for the years. Altman stated without people keeping hours, we don't know that fact. Holt stated we know what we are budgeting for. Mr. Dawson stated our hope is that this is too high and we can set our fee when the bids come in, convert it over and then we would only use the percentage of the program and you would not go over that amount. Mr. Dawson stated it is a small project. Holt motioned to approve the agreement. Dillinger seconded. Holt and Dillinger approved. Altman opposed. Motion carries. Mr. Howard asked if Browning Day has a contract? Altman stated yes. Browning's contract is for approximately \$24,000- \$28,000. Mr. Howard stated this contract can not exceed \$15,000 because that is all we have appropriated for at this time. Mr. Dawson stated once we get an appropriation for the project, our fee will be put in the project. Mr. Howard stated we have to look at a drop dead worse case scenario and he did not know that Browning Day had a contract. Mr. Howard stated there is \$40,000 appropriated for design. Holt stated we need to negate that vote and if the Council determines they do not want to go forward, then we pay hourly for the time Envoy has in it. Mr. Dawson stated they will take no money until after they have built the project. Dillinger stated we can't approve a contract that exceeds what has been appropriated. Mr. Dawson stated put them in for \$1,000 for pre-project time. If the project does not get funding all we get is \$1,000 to cover our costs. Holt asked Mr. Howard and Mr. Dawson to look at the contract.

**Innovative Data Now: [3:31:01]**

Mr. Larry Stout stated Innovative Mapping Solutions is proposing to package Hamilton County GIS Data with viewing software and sell it to the public. The product will be called Innovative Data Now. It will be useful to people who need to view maps and data from a notebook computer while not connected to the Internet. As described in Hamilton County Ordinance 9-22-97-A, Innovative needs permission from Hamilton County to redistribute our GIS Data. After negotiation they have agreed to pay Hamilton County a data maintenance fee equal to 15% of their revenue from product sales which is sales price minus software, tax, handling and shipping. What they are proposing is much like the IDS project we used to have. There is no annual fee to Hamilton County. Hamilton County is not interested in using the product internally, we have other software available to meet those needs. There is virtually no effort for Hamilton County to provide the data to them. They mostly download it from our Web site. Altman stated the GIS Board has approved this. Holt asked what data would they have access to? Mr. Stout stated basically the data we publish on the Internet, planimetric and topographic data; aerial photography, parcels, center lines. Holt asked about floor plans. Mr. Stout stated no. Altman stated we need to watch carefully what is on the Internet as a matter of course. Mr. Stout stated they would not have access to what is not on the Internet and we monitor very carefully what we put on the Internet. Altman stated we have an ordinance prohibiting distribution without approval. Altman motioned to approve. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Insurance Recommendations: [3:34:30]**

Mr. Bob Fearrin stated the Insurance Committee reviewed two plans, the fully insured plan we currently have and the partially self-funded insurance plan. Doug Walker, our agent, had requested bids from four companies. Only one company, Burhman, Flowers provided bids. The rest of the companies said we were getting too large and they did not want us. The Insurance Committee has recommended with go with the partially self-insured plan. This is much like the plan we had with Gallagher Bassett. We feel that the County is well run, the claim experience has been good and the decrease in number of claims the partially funded self-insured plan is best for the County. Dillinger asked if the Solid Waste Board coverage will be under this? Mr. Fearrin stated yes, it was his understanding that the General Liability for the Solid Waste Board is included as of January 1. The Solid Waste Board was added as an additional named insured in the last policy. In the new plan they will be insured under the County's Policy. Altman asked if that is under Errors and Omissions? Mr. Fearrin stated yes. That will be included in this new plan. That policy could be canceled, if that is what the Commissioners want to do. Dillinger stated the same thing applies for the general liability, is the Health Department a separate general liability policy and if so would that be covered under this plan? Mr. Fearrin stated the Health Department has always been included with the General Liability. They also have a Professional Liability Policy, those both will be included in whatever plan we chose. Dillinger asked Mr. Fearrin if he is going to make sure that we don't have duplicated coverage? Mr. Fearrin stated the only duplication coverage we would have would be the Errors & Omission Policy for the Solid Waste Board. Altman asked if the insurer knows that Solid Waste is a separate entity with non-county employees? Mr. John Dickerson stated yes they do. Altman stated the Board is a statutory entity that is separate and apart. Errors & Omissions would cover the Mayor of Noblesville and the representatives from Fishers. Mr. Dickerson stated they are being showed as a additional named insured, whether they are a separate entity or not. If they are additional name insured they are brought in under your policy any way. Mr. Howard asked for both E&O and General Liability provision? Mr. Fearrin stated yes. Mr. Fearrin stated we do have a problem with the Health Department's Professional Liability coverage. In the past that coverage has been written on a claims made basis. We are now going under the fully insured or partially self-insured plan for an occurrence basis for the Health Department. We have to buy Tail Coverage for the Health Department's Professional Liability. An example is that if they gave a flu shot in December and the claim did not manifest itself until May and we did not buy this Tail coverage, they would not have the Professional Liability Coverage. Altman asked if we are looking at two years? Mr. Dickerson stated there is no limitation, it is an extending reporting period with no limitation on the time. Altman asked if it is a one time premium? Mr. Dickerson stated yes. St. Paul was going off of a claims made form to an occurrence form on the renewal. It was St. Paul that offered the Tail Coverage, you would have to decide whether to purchase it regardless if you did anything else. Mr. Howard stated under Gallagher we had a

HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
JANUARY 26, 2004

\$30,000 deductible which included defense costs, then we moved down to a \$10,000 deductible which insured defense costs, where are we now? Mr. Dickerson stated on St. Paul you are on a \$25,000 deductible. Under the partially self-funded program it would be a \$50,000 SIR. You don't have many claims that fall within that \$25,000 and \$50,000. Altman stated we would need to cover Mr. Howard on an hourly basis. Mr. Howard stated under St. Paul, they have hired Counsel on a first basis, they do have investigation costs on a Tort Claim. Dillinger stated in 1999 we had 82 claims, 2000 - 73, 2001 - 72, 2002 - 61, 2003 - 42. Holt motioned to accept the Insurance Committee's recommendation to go the partially self-insured plan. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously. Altman motioned to purchase the Tail Coverage. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously. Mr. Fearrin stated we will need signatures and the Third Party Contract will need signed. Holt stated we are Bound? Mr. Dickerson and Mr. Fearrin stated we are Bound when the present policy expires. We can cancel the Solid Waste Policy.

**Envoy Contract:** [3:47:45]

Mr. Howard stated he and Mr. Dawson have changed the mark-up on the fees for the Judicial Center Renovation Project contract and pre-construction service phase would not exceed \$5,000. If the project goes forward it would be adjusted to a maximum of 5% of the costs of the project with the \$5,000 to be a credit. Holt motioned to amend his first motion to conform to the terms Mike just read in to the record. Dillinger seconded. Holt and Dillinger approved. Altman opposed. Motion carries.

**Humane Society Service Agreement:** [3:49:04]

Mr. Howard presented a revised Humane Society Service Agreement. Per animal cost is \$157.44. There is a monthly payment which will be adjusted in six months. There is a ceiling up to the amount that was budgeted by the County Council. It has a very detailed definition of a participating unit and a stray animal. This agreement would be circulated with addendums to various cities and towns to approve or disapprove it to determine whether or not their participating units. If they are participating units, they will reimburse the County at the per animal price set out in the agreement. If they are not they are free to negotiate with the Humane Society or do whatever they need to do, but they will not be beneficiaries to this particular agreement. Mr. David Sanders, Board President of the Humane Society, stated we would like to request the approval of this Service Agreement. Altman motioned to approve the amended contract. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Commissioner Committee Reports** [3:51:28]

**Emergency Management Grant:**

Altman stated the Emergency Management Committee has requested the Board's signature on a 2003 FEMA Emergency Management Performance Grant in the amount of \$822.58. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Urban Homeland Security Grant :**

Altman stated she has given the Commissioners a Urban Homeland Security draft. A paragraph has been revised regarding county communications and she is seeking authority to submit that with Marion County on or before the end of the month as required by the grant guidelines. Holt motioned to approve. Dillinger seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Attorney** [3:52:45]

**Liability Trust Claim:**

Mr. Howard requested approval of a Liability Trust Claim payable to Bastin, Dorell & Snyder in the amount of \$495.00. Altman motioned to approve. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Administrative Assistant:** [3:53:29]

**Riverview Hospital Board of Trustees Appointment:**

Dillinger motioned to reappoint Dr. Paul Frederick to the Riverview Hospital Board of Trustees. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Aviation Board:**

Holt motioned to appoint Tom Kapostasy to the Hamilton County Board of Aviation. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Weights and Measures:**

Mr. Carey Woodward made a slide presentation to the Board regarding the services that we provide Boone County. Weights & Measures did 1,822 inspections in 2003 for Boone County. Inspections in Hamilton County were 3,463 for a total of 5,265. The Boone County percentage of inspections amount to 34.6%. We are averaging about 25,000 miles per year. The vehicle is approaching 100,000 miles. Depreciation over six years on the tow vehicle is \$7,200 per year. The equipment depreciation over 15 years is \$2,263 per year. ISSD provides software and updates at \$1,500 per year. Sheriff's Department provides fuel in the amount of \$2,133 per year. Total expenditures including salaries and benefits is \$81,814 per year. Boone County's portion should be a minimum of \$28,304. Altman stated she sent a memo to Boone County including our budget with the inclusion of the additional payroll load. Altman will meet with Betty Lou Cooper to discuss this further.

**Board of Health Appointment:** [4:07:37]

Mr. Swift stated the President of the Hamilton County Board of Health brought to our attention the need to stagger the terms of Board members. Extending Virginia Lake's term to expire December 31, 2007 would accomplish that staggering. Altman motioned to correct the term to an expiration of December 31, 2007. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Welcome Letter:**

Mr. Swift had requested copies of welcome letters that are sent by the Hamilton County Alliance and Hamilton County Visitors and Convention Bureau. Holt stated he likes the Alliance letter. Altman stated either one is acceptable to her. Holt motioned to submit the Alliance copy. Altman suggested we co-sign it with the Visitor's Bureau and The Alliance? Mr. Swift stated it would break new ground with handbooks to date. Dillinger stated he likes the Visitor's Bureau. Holt stated he will defer, but he likes Altman's idea. Altman so moved. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**OSHA:**

Mr. Swift requested approval and signatures on the Work Related Injuries Report for OSHA. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Wage Determination Committee Appointments:**

Mr. Swift stated the Clay Township Trustee is requesting a Wage Determination Committee Appointment for Central Parks and they recommend Bill Merrill. Altman motioned to appoint Bill Merrill to the wage committee. Holt seconded.

HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
JANUARY 26, 2004

Motion carried unanimously. Fishers has requested a Wage Determination Committee Appointment for construction for a sledge storage building, they recommend Jonathan Valenta. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously. City of Carmel has requested an appointment to their Wage Determination Committee for Carmel Redevelopment, they recommend Paul Pace. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Auditor** [4:13:33]

**Microvote Election Software Maintenance Agreement:**

Ms. Robin Mills requested approval of the Microvote Election Management System Software Maintenance Agreement. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Covered Bridge Certification:**

Ms. Mills requested approval of the Covered Bridge Certification which certifies that Hamilton County has one (1) Covered Bridge. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Treasurer's Report:**

Ms. Mills requested acceptance of the Treasurers report ending December 31, 2003. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Acceptance of Bonds/Letters of Credit - Drainage Board:**

Ms. Mills requested acceptance of the Bonds and Letters of Credit for the Drainage Board. 1) HCDB-2004-0004 - Bond Safeguard Insurance Company Subdivision Improvements Performance Bond No. 526079S for Guilford Park monumentation for \$8,000. (Rider reducing the Surety for Guildford Park from \$290,000 to \$8,000 to cover the monumentation requirements for the subdivision.)

**2003 Gross Wages:**

Mr. Mills requested acceptance of the 2003 Gross Wages Report. Total Payroll for 2003 was \$24,948,251.47. Altman motioned to approve. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Liability Trust Claim:**

Ms. Mills requested approval of a Liability Trust Claim in the amount of \$6,000 payable to The St. Paul Companies. Altman motioned to approve. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Payroll Claims:**

Ms. Mills requested approval of the Payroll to be paid January 30, 2004. Altman motioned to approve. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Vendor Claims:**

Ms. Mills requested approval of the Vendor Claims to be paid January 27, 2004. Altman motioned to approve. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Cum Courthouse Fund:**

Mr. Howard stated if we eliminate or reduce the amount that is generated in any Cum Fund and do not have another Cum Fund that absorbs that levy then you lose that amount as to your maximum levy. The Cum Bridge that we have discussed, if it is your intent to reduce that and fund it totally from COIT as opposed to Property Tax, then you will have to replace that levy into Cum Courthouse. Altman motioned to create the Cum Courthouse Fund. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Humane Society Contract:**

Ms. Mills asked Mr. Howard if he will be getting the Humane Society Agreement Addendums to the entities? Mr. Howard stated he will get it to the Auditor and send it to the Clerk-Treasurers as a one page attachment. Altman suggested we make it an agreement that is attached as an Interlocal Agreement? Mr. Howard stated it would be an Interlocal Agreement between Hamilton County and them.

Holt motioned to adjourn the meeting. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously. [4:18:23]



HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
JANUARY 26, 2004

**Correspondence**

Beam, Longest and Neff Notice of Transmittal:  
    Bridge #110, 186th Street over Cool Creek  
    Bridge #257, Lantern Road over Shoemaker Ditch  
Notice of Neighborhood Meeting for Riverview Medical Park  
Notice of Relocation of January Carmel BZA Meeting  
Notice of Public Hearing:  
    11270 Fall Creek Road - Fishers  
IDEM Notice of Sewer Permit Applications:  
    The Highlands at Stony Creek, Section 3C - Noblesville  
    Cumberland Pointe, Section One & Howe Place - Noblesville  
IDEM Authorization for Construction of Sewer System:  
    Interstate Holdings, LLC @ 113th Street and Olio Road  
IDEM Notice of Appeal Rights:  
    The Townes at Noble West - Noblesville  
    The Intracoastal at Geist, Section 4A - Fishers  
    South Avalon Estates, Section 1 & 2 - Fishers  
    Waterman Farms, Section 1 - Noblesville

**Present**

Christine Altman, Commissioner  
Steven C. Dillinger, Commissioner  
Steven A. Holt, Commissioner  
Robin M. Mills, Auditor  
Kim Rauch, Administrative Assistant to Auditor  
Fred Swift, Administrative Assistant to Commissioners  
Michael A. Howard, Attorney  
Marc Bowen, Sheriff’s Department  
Brad Davis, Highway Director  
Jim Neal, Highway Engineer  
Virginia Hughes, Administrative Assistant to Highway Engineer  
Amber Emery, Highway Public Service Representative  
Dave Lucas, Highway Inspector  
Robert Chadwell, Highway Inspector  
Steve Broermann, Highway Technical Engineer  
Christopher Burt, Highway Staff Engineer  
Tim Knapp, Highway Right-of-Way Specialist  
Joel Thurman, Highway Project Engineer  
Matt Knight, Highway Staff Engineer  
Sally Wilson, Treasurer  
Mike Booth, Town of Fishers  
Becki Wise, USI  
Cindy Ramsey, Humane Society  
David Sanders, Humane Society  
Jim Gillaspy, Indianapolis Star  
Larry Stout, GIS Manager  
Phil Worrall, Innovative Mapping  
Moly Laut, Innovative Mapping  
Larry Dawson, Envoy  
Dan Mayer, Envoy  
Ralph Watson, Community Corrections  
Dan McCloskey, Browning, Day, Mullins Dierdorf  
Scott Warner, Buildings & Grounds  
COMMISSIONERS  
Chanda Gilmore, Probation  
Jeff Marcum, Sheriff’s Department

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Bragg, Probation  
CJ Miller, Probation

\_\_\_\_\_  
Rob Creviston, Juvenile Detention  
Floyd Burroughs, Floyd E. Burroughs & Associates  
Dave Richter, United Consulting  
Steve Passey, United Consulting  
John Dierdorf, Browning, Day, Mullins, Dierdorf  
Bob Fearrin, Fearrin Insurance  
Theresa Thomas, Prosecutor  
Don Dickerson, Burham, Flowers, Insurance  
David Henricks, 7440 E. 256th Street, Arcadia

APPROVED  
HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Robin M. Mills, Auditor